

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ANGELIQUE MARIE STEWART	:	CIVIL ACTION
<i>Plaintiff</i>	:	
	:	
	:	No. 16-6459
v.	:	
	:	
NANCY A. BERRYHILL, Acting	:	
Commissioner of Social Security	:	
Administration	:	
<i>Defendant</i>	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 23rd day of January 2018, upon consideration of the *Report and Recommendation* issued on January 3, 2018, by the Honorable Richard A. Lloret, United States Magistrate Judge (“the Magistrate Judge”), [ECF 14], and after a careful and independent review of the record, this Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge’s conclusion that the findings of fact and conclusions of law, as determined by the Administrative Law Judge in this matter, are supported by substantial evidence.¹ Consequently, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The *Report and Recommendation* is APPROVED and ADOPTED.
2. Plaintiff’s Request for Review is DENIED.
3. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Nitzia I. Quiñones Alejandro
NITZA I. QUIÑONES ALEJANDRO
Judge, United States District Court

¹ Neither Plaintiff nor the Acting Commissioner filed any objection and/or response to the *Report and Recommendation* (the “R&R”). In the absence of any objections, this Court reviewed the R&R under the “plain error” standard. *See Facyson v. Barnhart*, 2003 WL 22436274, at *2 (E.D. Pa. May 30, 2003). Under this plain error standard of review, an R&R should only be rejected if the magistrate judge commits an error that was “(1) clear or obvious, (2) affect[ed] ‘substantial rights,’ and (3) seriously affected the fairness, integrity or public reputation of judicial proceedings.” *Leyva v. Williams*, 504 F.3d 357, 363 (3d Cir. 2007) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, after a thorough review of the record and the R&R, this Court finds no error and, therefore, adopts the R&R in its entirety.